

### REMARKS

The following remarks are submitted to be fully responsive to the final Office Action of **January 26, 2006**. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Contrary to the assertion in the present Office Action, the present independent claim 15 and the claims dependent therefrom, are patently distinguishable over *Wyman* (USP 5,204,897), because *Wyman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the features recited in the claims. For example, independent claim 15 (emphasis added), recites:

A digital right management system, comprising:  
a secure component;  
an interface between said secure component and a software application;  
said secure component processes requests coming from said software application through said interface;  
**said secure component validates signatures of one or more certificate documents to verify that said software application is compatible with said secure component;**  
in the case of verification of compatibility, said secure component allows operation of said software application; and  
in the case of incompatibility, said secure component refuses to allow operation of said software application through said interface.

Thus, independent claim 15 is directed to the novel feature of a secure component that validates signatures of one or more certificate documents to verify that a **software application is compatible** with the secure component. By contrast, as admitted in the present Office Action, *Wyman* discloses a “secure container or environment [that] validates signatures of one or more documents to verify that one the one or more **documents are compatible** with the secure container.” Accordingly, *Wyman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the noted features, as recited in independent 15.

The present office action states at p. 3 that “the Examiners does not find any significant differences, but merely a change in label or in the wordings between the prior claims and the instantly amended claims.” Applicants, however, note that the previous claims recited “said secure container **validates signatures of one or more documents to verify** that said one or more **documents are compatible** with said secure container” while the present claims recite “said secure component **validates signatures of one or more certificate documents to verify** that said **software application is compatible** with said secure component,” and which is not a mere change of labeling.

The present Office Action merely repeats its previous rejection and thus fails to address how *Wyman* discloses, teaches, or suggests a secure component that validates signatures of one or more certificate documents to verify that a software application is compatible with the secure component, as recited in independent claim 15.

The dependent claims are allowable on their on merits and for at least the reasons as argued above with respect to independent claim 15.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON PEABODY, LLP**

/Carlos R. Villamar, Reg. # 43,224/  
Carlos R. Villamar  
Reg. No. 43,224

**NIXON PEABODY LLP**  
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204  
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel: 202-585-8000  
Fax: 202-585-8080